

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Implementation of Section 304 of the)	CS Docket No. 97-80
Telecommunications Act of 1996)	
)	
Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices)	
)	
Compatibility Between Cable Systems and)	PP Docket No. 00-67
Consumer Electronics Equipment)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF
SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION**

Adam Goldberg
Director, Television Standards &
Policy Development
Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc.
8605 Westwood Center Drive
Suite 206
Vienna, VA 22182
703-556-4406

March 15, 2004

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Implementation of Section 304 of the)	CS Docket No. 97-80
Telecommunications Act of 1996)	
)	
Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices)	
)	
Compatibility Between Cable Systems and)	PP Docket No. 00-67
Consumer Electronics Equipment)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF
SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION**

Sharp Electronics Corporation, Inc. and Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc. (“SHARP”) respectfully submit this Reply to Comments that were submitted in answer to the Commission’s Second Further Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking in the above-captioned proceeding.¹

SHARP joins in the Consumer Electronics Association (“CEA”) and the Consumer Electronics Retailers Coalition (“CERC”) Reply Comments filed today, and wishes to clarify one detail: although we participated in technical selection of the Constrained Image Trigger, we are opposed to image constraints for all content, including Unencrypted Broadcast Television..

In its comments, The National Cable & Telecommunications Association (“NCTA”) states that there was some agreement between consumer electronics manufacturers and the cable industry on image constraint.² This is not true.

¹ *In the Matter of Implementation of Section 304 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices, Compatibility Between Cable Systems and Consumer Electronics Equipment*, CS Docket No. 97-80, PP Docket No. 00-67, Report And Order And Second Further Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking (rel. Oct. 9, 2003) (“SFNPRM”).

² *In the Matter of Implementation of Section 304 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices, Compatibility Between Cable Systems and Consumer Electronics Equipment*, CS Docket No. 97-

Downresolution Trigger Technology

After the SFNPRM, the cable industry unilaterally made downresolution capability in receivers a precondition to the availability of the DFAST license, and also suggested a technically poor mechanism for triggering downresolution.³

In response to the original cable industry proposal for downresolution signaling, SHARP suggested a better technical solution. This was no more than a grudging willingness to improve a clearly flawed technical method, and should not have been construed as an agreement to accept downresolution product requirements. Without clear direction from the Commission, the consumer electronics industry was powerless to resist inclusion of downresolution requirements in the terms of the DFAST license.

Furthermore, the NCTA Comments indicate that “The CE and cable industries plan to submit this image constraint technology to SCTE as a modification to SCTE-41 [sic].”⁴ SHARP does not speak for the entire consumer electronics industry; however, we do not plan to submit the downresolution trigger to SCTE for standardization, and we would oppose such an effort.

The Effect of Downresolution on the Public

For many years, the content industry failed to support various interfaces for high definition content.⁵ As a result, the consumer electronics industry faced great uncertainty about which digital interfaces would eventually be ubiquitous. In this environment, SHARP and other

80, PP Docket No. 00-67, Comments of The National Cable & Telecommunications Association in Response to Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Feb. 13, 2004) (“NCTA Comments”), p. 3.

³ The original cable proposal for downresolution signaling was to require that all content not labeled “Copy Freely” was to be downrez’d. Such a requirement would have precluded any encoding rules or prohibition of the use of downresolution.

⁴ NCTA Comments, *loc. cit.*

⁵ Note that only two studios have signed the DTLA “Content Participation Agreement”, and IEEE-1394/DTCP is not yet an approved output for DVD players.

consumer electronics manufacturers were essentially forced to build devices with the only ubiquitous interface available – component analog high definition. SHARP has been shipping High Definition TV product to consumer for years. Any image constraints on component analog interfaces (whether signaled via the Constrained Image Trigger or otherwise) will adversely affect our customers, MPAA's casual retail observations notwithstanding.⁶

In summary, SHARP is opposed to image constraints.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharp Electronics Corporation, Inc.

Adam Goldberg

Adam Goldberg
Director, Television Standards &
Policy Development
Sharp Laboratories of America, Inc.
8605 Westwood Center Dr., Suite 206
Vienna, VA 22182
703-556-4406

Dated: March 15, 2004

⁶ Letter from Bruce Boyden to Marlene H. Dortch in CS Docket No. 97-80, May 7, 2003.